



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,235	11/04/2003	Robert A. West	03-987	5256

20306 7590 08/03/2007  
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP  
300 S. WACKER DRIVE  
32ND FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

BARTLEY, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3693

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/701,235

Applicant(s)

WEST, ROBERT A.

Examiner

Kenneth L. Bartley

Art Unit

3693

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kenneth L. Bartley (Examiner).

(3) Monika Dudek (Applicant's Rep.).

(2) Jagdish Patel (Primary Examiner).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent 5,339,392 and U.S. Patent 7,146,615.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant did not believe 2<sup>nd</sup> prior art met claim elements (see below for more detail).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
JAMES A. KRAMER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

1. The Applicant's representative (Monika Dudek) explained the invention.
2. Claim 1 was discussed with regard to the prior art rejections. In particular, Applicant did not believe 2<sup>nd</sup> prior art used for 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, U.S. 7,146,615, provided event triggers with a different arrangement of a plurality of windows.
3. The Applicant will file a response to the final rejection and Examiner will review the prior art used in the final Office Action and respond appropriately.